

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: The Indiana APR for FFY 2005 was developed by the lead agency utilizing direction and input from a broad group of stakeholders made up of parents, providers, contractors, state staff, and community leaders from the Indiana Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), Local Planning and Coordinating Councils, System Points of Entry, Quality Review Teams, the Central Reimbursement Office (CRO), and staff from Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Bureau of Child Development Services (BCDS) and the Indiana Department of Education, Division of Exceptional Learners. Several stakeholder meetings were held in 2005 and 2006 to discuss the State Performance Plan and Indiana's progress in meeting its targets and the effects of rule changes for eligibility and cost participation.

Indiana has published its State performance Plan (SPP) on the state First Steps web page at http://www.in.gov/fssa/first_step/pdf/in20052010spppartc120205.pdf. Additionally, Indiana has posted OSEP's letter responding to the State's December 2005 SPP, http://www.in.gov/fssa/first_step/pdf/DOE%20letter%20march06page6.pdf. The SPP has also been published in the provider training newsletter, *The Training Times* at <http://www.utsprokids.org/TT%20vol%202%20%20iss1%20Final.PDF>. Indiana will post the revised SPP, APR and OSEP's response to it, following its submission on February 1, 2007.

Indiana revised the December 2005 SPP, as requested in OSEP's December 2005 SPP letter. The correct child count tables from FFY 2004 were added and all issues were addressed.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSP receive the early intervention services on their IFSP within <u>30 calendar days from IFSP date, with parental consent</u>

Definition of Timely: While Indiana places a high priority on the delivery of services in a timely manner, prior to the submission of the 2005 SPP, Indiana did not have a formal definition for timely services. Timely previously was defined on an individual basis by the family, the service coordinator and the team. Indiana relied on the parents, service coordinator and providers to contact the System Point of Entry or the lead agency when services were not being delivered as authorized. In past years, Indiana would review the number of authorizations written compared

with the number of claims paid. The state also sampled records to determine if all services authorized were provided to families.

In the 2005 SPP, Indiana has defined timely as ***all services written in the IFSP are initiated within 30 calendar days from the IFSP date, with parent approval.*** The expectation is that 30 days represents a reasonable amount of time that should be allowed for services to begin. This time period allows adequate time for authorized services to be entered in the CRO database, for providers to be selected and for appointments with the family to be scheduled. As recommended by OSEP, in the SPP December 2005 letter, Indiana will allow an exception for IFSPs services that are delayed due to exceptional family circumstances.

For FFY 2005, Indiana chose to review a sample of IFSPs written between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006 to determine if IFSP services were initiated within 30 days of the IFSP date, with parent approval. The **Sampling Unit** for this indicator included all children with an IFSP written during FFY 2005, (15,405). The **Sample Size** of 165 IFSPs was determined by using a sampling calculator made available from the website (<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>) by Raosoft, Inc. The number selected for this sample reflects a confidence level of 99%, with a confidence interval of +/- 10%. The **Stratification Description** used to ensure that all eligible children's IFSPs could be included in the sample employed a sampling strategy that used a proportional random selection process based on the following strata: (1) urban or rural residence, (2) gender and (3) ethnicity. The purpose of using these categories was to insure adequate representation of all children receiving First Steps services in Indiana. The data collection strategy involved samples from two counties in each of the nine regional clusters, using the same sample proportion as that of children receiving First Steps services in those counties (Table A)

Table A – APR Indicator 1 Sample Plan

	Part C total	% of Part C	Sample size	Rural	Male	Female	White	AA	Hispanic	Multi	Asian
Indiana - Statewide	15,405	100%		28%	63%	37%	78%	10%	6%	5%	1%
Actual Sample			168	25%	65%	35%	77%	10%	6.5%	5%	1%
Demographics											
Cluster A	2,091	11%	18				65	16	12	6	
Jasper	69	0.4	3	mixed			90	0	9	0	
Lake (Gary, Hammond)	1,237	6.4	15	no			55	23	16	6	
Cluster B	1,929	10%	16				72	11	11	5	
Elkhart	548	2.8	5	mixed			65	9	18	8	
St. Joseph (So. Bend)	878	4.6	11	mixed			66	17	9	6	
Cluster CH	3,151	16.40%	27				80	8	4	6	
Allen (Ft. Wayne)	1,221	6.3	18	no			67	16	7	7	
Madison	342	1.8	9	mixed			81	9	5	5	
Cluster D	1,137	5.90%	10				85	2	7	4	
Carroll	44	0.2	2	mixed			89	4.5	2	4.5	
Tippecanoe (W. Lafayette)	469	2.4	8	no			75	4	10	7	3
Cluster E	1,106	5.70%	9				88	3	4	4	
Fulton	45	0.2	2	yes			91	2	7		
Howard (Kokomo)	226	1.2	7	no			91	4	3	2	
Cluster F		5.30%	9				95	1.5	0.5	3	

	1,012								
Parke	29	0.2	2	yes	97	0	0	3	
Vigo (Terre Haute)	299	1.6	7	no	91	3	1	5	
Cluster G	5,771	30%	50		70	17	7	4	
Hamilton	1,153	6	17	no	90	3	1	2	
Marion (Indpls.)	3,404	18	33	no	55	26	11	5	
Cluster I	2,020	10.50%	17		88	4	2	4	
Floyd	265	1.4	8	no	84	9	2	4	
Vanderburgh (Evansville)	514	2.7	9	no	83	7	2	6	1.5
Cluster J	1,357	7%	12		89	1	3	5	2
Bartholomew	279	1.4	6	no	80	2	6	9	3
Monroe (Bloomington)	297	1.5	6	no	87	2	1	6	4

A random list of children from the sample plan was sent to each cluster. The cluster copied the service page of each child's IFSP. Each provider listed on the IFSP service page was contacted and required to submit a face-to-face encounter form from their first with the child and family. Face-to-face encounter forms are required for all child/family visits. Providers must maintain a copies of these forms to substantiate all claims for services rendered. The face-to-face encounter forms were reviewed to insure that the date of the first visit was within 30 calendar days of the IFSP date. Reasons for non-compliance were recorded.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: The actual sample included 168 IFSPs written from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 were reviewed. **The state total for the provision of every service written on the IFSP, with 30 days of the IFSP date was 91% (Table B).** Of the IFSPs reviewed, 54% were written for Service Coordination and one other service, while 45% of the IFSPs had service coordination and multiple other services. 1% listed service coordination as the only service. 100% of the IFSPs reviewed had service coordination initiated within 30 days of the IFSP. (Indiana utilizes two levels of service coordination. The Intake Coordinator serves the family from referral through the initial IFSP, when the ongoing service coordinator is selected. 95% of the IFSPs reviewed had service coordination and at least one other service initiated with 30 days of the IFSP. Two cluster demonstrated 100% compliance of all services initiated within 30 days.

Table B: IFSPs Services within 30 days of IFSP Date

	# of IFSPs reviewed	% IFSPs with all services in 30 days, excluding family choice to delay	% IFSPs with ≥ one service initiated in 30 days	% IFSPs with no services initiated ≥ 30 days	# Family Choice to delay service(s)
Sample Total	168	91% (153)	95% (160)	5% (8)	17/168
Cluster A	18	83% (15)	94% (17)	6% (1)	2/18
Cluster B	16	94% (15)	94% (15)	6% (1)	1/16
Cluster CH	27	93% (25)	93% (25)	7% (2)	1/27
Cluster D	10	80% (8)	80% (8)	20% (2)	0/10
Cluster E	9	89% (8)	100% (9)	0% (0)	1/9
Cluster F	9	89% (8)	89% (8)	11% (1)	0/9
Cluster G	50	88% (44)	96% (48)	4% (2)	3/50

Cluster I	17	100% (17)	100% (17)	0% (0)	1/17
Cluster J	12	100% (12)	100% (12)	0% (0)	0/12

Account for untimely receipt of services for FFY 2005 - Reasons for untimely services included the following:

- 40% (3/8) - provider chosen was not available
- 25% (2/8) - a specific therapist with specific skill was unavailable, ex. bilingual provider
- 25% (2/8) - delayed while waiting for a physician signature for IFSP services
- 10% (1/8) - provider was not immediately notified that the family selected them

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: In FFY 04 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005), no file review sampling was performed. Data from the CRO database was reviewed for all authorized services written in every child's initial IFSP. This data was compared to the first service claim date for each authorization to determine the number of IFSP early intervention services provided within 30 days of the IFSP date. Based on claims/authorization data, eighty percent (80%) of infants and toddlers were found to have received all IFSP early intervention services within 30 calendar days of the IFSP date. Indiana felt this data was flawed in that it could not account for duplicate, changed or canceled authorizations. The sample review of IFSPs written in FFY 05, demonstrated a significant improvement in the percent of IFSP services provided within 30 days of the IFSP date.

The December 2005 SPP letter noted that this indicator was found to be in non-compliance for FFY 2004, but in subsequent telephone conversations, between OSEP and the lead agency it was noted that for FFY 04, there was no definition of timely. As stated, timely previously was defined on an individual basis by the family, the service coordinator and the team. Indiana relied on the parents, service coordinator and providers to contact the System Point of Entry or the lead agency when services were not being delivered as authorized.

In December 2005, the lead agency and the CRO were in the process of adapting a web-based data system that would capture the IFSP date and the initial service visit for all authorized IFSP services. Web-SPOE was to be completed in January of 2006, but design set backs occurred. This necessitated the use of sampling for FFY 2005. Web-SPOE remains in the development phase and is anticipated to be operational in late 2007. Once Web-SPOE is operational, Indiana will be able to provide data on timely services for every active IFSP.

Until Web-SPOE is operational, Indiana added the review of timeliness for all IFSP services to its Quality Review – Focused Monitoring System. Part of the Indiana Quality Review process consists of monthly random early intervention record reviews for each Service Coordinator on the intake process for a newly eligible child/family and on the annual IFSP development. (Appendix ___ - Intake and Annual Review forms). The review form includes documentation that services were initiated within 30 days of the IFSP date. This process was initiated August 1, 2006. Data utilizing this source of information will be available for the FFY 2006 APR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: The proposed target for this indicator must be 100%. While not currently at 100%, Indiana has demonstrated a significant improvement towards reaching this target. The following improvement activities are being implemented. In 2206, Indiana provided

training to all enrolled providers regarding the definition of timely services. The issue was discussed in the statewide training newsletter, the Training Times in February 2006 and it was included in the annual mandatory provider meetings in April 2006. SPOE supervisors and service coordinator supervisors were trained regarding the definition of timely and the documentation guidelines for quality review-focused monitoring record audits, at their quarterly meeting

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

FFY	Improvement Activities	Resources	On-going Activity*
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continued training activities for providers, service coordinators and intake coordinators on the definition of <u>timely services</u>. ▪ Update all provider agreements to include statements defining timely provision of services. ▪ Monitoring and quality review activities to ensure provision of services in a timely manner ▪ Enhancements to the data system to better track and eliminate duplicate authorizations ▪ Statewide Data System to track and monitor for quality review purposes. 	Unified Training System Training Times FSSA Focused Monitoring CRO enrollment Statewide Data System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ongoing thru 2010 ▪ 2007 ▪ Ongoing thru 2010
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Timely Services outcome-based performance standard will be added to Request for Funding contracts; to include financial holdbacks for non-compliance. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2008
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NOTE: See on-going activities identified above. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing thru 2010
2009 (2009-2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTE: See on-going activities identified above. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing thru 2010
2010 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTE: See on-going activities identified above. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing thru 2010

* On-going Activity = activity will occur each subsequent year